

## REMARKS

Claims 1-30 stand rejected. Claims 1-30 remain pending in the patent application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments herein to the patent application do not add new matter to it.

### 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-8, 12-18 and 20-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hall et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,898,831 (hereinafter Hall).

### CLAIM 1

Applicants respectfully contend that Hall fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in newly amended independent Claim 1. For instance, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

a portable computing device comprising a radio frequency identification integrated circuit that outputs a radio frequency signal containing a security code in response to being located within a radio frequency signal field where said radio frequency identification integrated circuit picks up enough radio frequency energy to cause said radio frequency identification integrated circuit to become energized to output said radio frequency signal, said radio frequency identification integrated circuit is inactive except when located within said radio frequency signal field;

Applicants respectfully assert that Hall does not teach or suggest that the radio frequency identification integrated circuit picks up enough radio frequency energy to

cause it to become energized to output the radio frequency signal as explicitly recited in amended Claim 1. For example, Applicants respectfully contend that Hall is silent with regard to a radio frequency identification integrated circuit that operates in the specific manner recited in amended Claim 1. Since Hall fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that Hall cannot anticipate amended Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 1 is allowable over Hall.

### CLAIM 12

Applicants respectfully assert that Hall fails to teach or suggest subject matter recited in newly amended independent Claim 12. For instance, amended Claim 12 recites in part (emphasis added):

a portable computer system that outputs a signal containing a password after slid into said docking station, wherein said docking station receives and outputs said signal;

Applicants respectfully contend that Hall does not teach or suggest a portable computer system that outputs a signal containing a password after slid into the docking station, wherein the docking station receives and outputs the signal as explicitly recited in amended Claim 12. For example, Applicants respectfully assert that Hall is silent with regard to sliding a portable computer system into a docking station as specifically recited in amended Claim 12. Since Hall fails to teach or suggest at least one element specifically recited in amended Claim 12, Applicants respectfully assert that Hall cannot

anticipate amended Claim 12. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit amended Claim 12 is allowable over Hall.

#### CLAIM 21

Applicants respectfully contend that amended independent Claim 21 is not anticipate by Hall based on rationale similar to that discussed above with reference to amended independent Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 21 is allowable over Hall.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of rejected Claims 1-30.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Dated: DEC. 10, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thomas M. Catale', written over a horizontal line.

Thomas M. Catale  
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

Phone: (408) 938-9060  
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069